

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/650,086	BREDT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Callie E. Shosho	1714	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** Allowed

 (1) Callie E. Shosho.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Natasha Us.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 13 September 2007
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

6-7, 10-12, 18-19, 22-23, 43, 49-50, 63, 66, 76

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. Part II above.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner's amendment was agreed to and authorized by Ms. Us.

The amendments to the specification were made to update the continuity information and to delete a phrase unintentionally included in the specification as indicated by the strikethrough.

The amendments to each of claims 6, 7, 11, 18, and 22 to insert the phrase "water-soluble" was made to ensure that each of the claims has proper antecedent basis.

The amendment to each of claims 12, 19, and 23, which each depend on claim 1, was made given examiner's position that the scope of each of the claims was confusing given that it was not clear why each claim recited that the filler "further" comprises an ingredient when there were no specific fillers recited in present claim 1.

The amendment to claim 10 was made to ensure that the claim has proper antecedent basis.

The amendment to claim 43 was made so that the claim recites proper Markush language.

The amendment to claim 49 to delete "cellulose derivative fiber" was made given the examiner's position that the scope of the claim was confusing given that it was not clear what was meant by "derivative" or what types of cellulose fibers this phrase encompassed.

The amendment to claim 50 was made to correct a minor grammatical error.

The amendment to claim 63 was made so that the claim has proper antecedent basis.

The amendment to claim 66 was made so that the claim has a properly spelled status identifier.

The amendment to claim 76 was made to delete "such as" language.